

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JAN 10 2008

## In the United States Patent and Trademark Office

Applicant: David F. Arlasky  
Serial No. 10/623,960  
Filed: 17 July 2003  
For IMPROVED MUFFLER

| Before the Examiner  
| Edgardo San Martin  
| Art Unit 2837  
|

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

AMENDMENT RESPONSIVE TO 09/10/2007 ACTION

Sir:

This Amendment is responsive to the Office action mailed 09/10/2007.

1. CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 USC Sec. 112

The examiner objected to Claims 67 and 68 containing the phrase "the chamber being substantially many times greater than", making the claims indefinite. These claims have been cancelled.

2. CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 USC Sec. 103

The claims previously in the case were rejected as obvious over Chang (US 6,343,673) in view of Weiss et al (US 4,263,981).

Applicant respectfully traverses the examiner's finding that Chang teaches that the propeller type blade assembly is "*arranged in the inlet tube*". Chang's vane wheels 34 and 35 are arranged centrally of the inlet tube which extend through the exhaust chamber. Chang has no enlarged chamber and the gas is moved straight through the inner tube 41. These vane wheels 34 and 35 are substantially in line with the gas flow. As Chang states, at Col. 2, lines 45 et seq., "the gas flow exerts an impact on the rear vane wheel 35, thereby forming a **pressure back effect** of an **interfering current...** (emphasis added), and thus a back pressure in the system. Applicant on the